



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is fortunate for the country's honor, as well as for her welfare in the long run, that there is no large following of Senators Lodge, Morgan and others, who propose, in loud language, that we unceremoniously push Great Britain out of the way, or attempt to do so, by abrogating the treaty, and go on and construct the canal and retain the entire control of it, as if the national word pledged solemnly in a treaty were only a thing of temporary expediency.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty ought never to have been amended, as we said when it was under consideration in the Senate. It was the finest document of its kind ever drawn between two great powers. It embodied in its way the beneficent new international spirit which has been so conspicuously expressed in the Hague Conference and its results. It was a fine practical recognition of the growing community of interest of the nations and of the value of friendly coöperation. It is a very great honor to our country that the treaty, which has now lapsed by the time limit, originated with our Secretary of State, a man who has in him more of the best international spirit of the time than a pretty large collection of other men whom one might mention. It is distinctly discreditable to the United States that the Senate took the marrow out of the treaty and made it conform as much as possible to the narrow, grasping, exclusive spirit which has ruled the nations to their grievous hurt in the past. Secretary Hay and Lord Pauncefote meant to make the canal, if ever built, a bulwark against war, a perpetual bond of peace. The senators who spoiled it and condemned it to defeat wished to keep the gaps down for war, and that the canal should be a reserved instrument of war in the hands of our country at all times.

It is said that negotiations will early be renewed for another treaty. If so, its terms ought to run closely along the lines of the late treaty as originally drawn. This will doubtless be the case, if the canal is ever built. England is sure not to yield entirely what she considers her rights in the matter, and our government will not be guilty of the extreme folly of going to war to compel her to do so.

An isthmian canal ought to be built. It would pay for itself many times over within a generation or two. It will be built, in spite of the combined opposition of the transcontinental railway corporations or of any others, which may delay it for a time. Not Great Britain and the United States alone, but all the maritime powers, in fact all the peoples of the world, are interested in having it constructed. The Suez canal is important; but this would be tenfold, or rather a hundredfold, more important. More commerce would go through it in thirty days than through the Suez in a year. It would almost make the Atlantic and the Pacific one ocean, the two seas around which the great events of the future are to take place.

When the canal is constructed it ought to be made

strictly an international waterway, and neutralized universally and for all time. All really international waterways, natural or artificial, ought to be so neutralized. That the Suez Canal is not completely neutralized is no reason that the proposed isthmian one should not be. The one at Suez ought to be. The Strait of Gibraltar, to that end and for its own sake, ought to be neutralized and made a perfectly open waterway, all fortification on each side of it being taken away. So ought the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. But more reasons can be given for the internationalization of the proposed isthmian canal than for any of the others or all of them combined. It will be the world canal for all time. It will be outside of United States territory. Our country cannot, in the nature of the case, have exclusive rights in it, and ought not therefore to have unlimited control of it.

What really ought to be done in the case of this canal is that it should be built by the nations jointly. They should each contribute to the expense of construction, and then unite to neutralize it and to make it free to all the ships of the world, the expense of maintenance being met by a small contribution from each of the powers, or by a toll on passing ships just sufficient for the purpose. This would all be very simple if the nations were inspired by the true spirit of humanity, which will some day reign, and bring this and a thousand other very simple things to pass. This is, of course, impossible now. It is beyond the present range of statesmen and diplomatists, and of the intelligence and spirit of peoples. But it should be approached as nearly as possible, by the carrying into execution of at least as much as Secretary Hay and Lord Pauncefote have mapped out as entirely practicable.

Editorial Notes.

Harrison's Death.

The removal of Ex-President Harrison by death at the present time is greatly to be deplored. The recent utterances of the eminent statesman on public questions had made it clear not only that his intellectual powers had grown remarkably in his later years, but also that his development in political wisdom had been no less marked. He had come to a maturity and clearness of insight and judgment that would have made his counsels of very great utility to the nation in the years of testing and peril now upon us. His articles in the last two numbers of the *North American Review* were among the most noteworthy discussions of current questions that have appeared. They exhibited true American insight into the root principles of the questions now agitating the nation, and ought to be widely and seriously read as the departed Ex-President's last and maturest word to his countrymen. Mr. Harrison at one time had a distinct touch of something that would

have been hard to distinguish from current imperialism. Jingoism, in the light of the Chilean affair, would perhaps be the more appropriate word. It is doubtful, too, if, in the effort to annex Hawaii, through virtual support of the revolution by American force, Mr. Harrison had the remotest idea that the United States would ever adopt a colonial system and attempt to govern a vassal people. But release from official position, and opportunity in private, free from the pressure of official temptation, to study the fundamental character of the questions now before the country, seems to have entirely cured him of the taint and led him to place himself alongside Senator Hoar, Ex-Senator Edmunds, Ex-President Cleveland and others. His criticism of the policy on which the government has entered was in some respects keener and more penetrating than that of any other public man. It certainly was felt more deeply. Not the least of the services to civilization which Mr. Harrison might have been expected to render in coming years would have been his counsels in the international court of arbitration just organized. His experience as President, as senator, as jurist, as lecturer on international law, as counsel in the Venezuela arbitration, marked him as certain to have been among the very first in that distinguished international body. It seems unfortunate in every way that he should have been stricken down at a moment when a period of such world-wide influence was just opening to him, when every utterance of his on public questions at once attracted the ear of the world. The greatest tribute which the nation can pay to him will be to take his patriotic reproof to heart and to heed the last noble counsels which fell from his tongue and pen.

Another Cycle of Tyranny.

There are some sentences in the following passage from the *Social Crusader*, the organ of the Dr. Herron Social Crusade, that we should not have written. Some of the statements are overdrawn, and contain more or less unfairness to many individuals. But, nevertheless, there is a thread of painful truth running through the whole,—a big thread, a great rope, be it said, whose presence makes almost unnoticeable the extravagance of statement:

“Men who have watched Congress during the past session, hoping for some faint gleam of the old national integrity, stand aghast at the bald and ruthless violation of all our pledges to the world. The Ship Subsidy Bill, the stalking horse for the so-called Democrats to cry out upon, pales in significance before the unanimous consent of Republicans, Democrats, Populists—all traitors of the same class bearing different names—to the imperialistic ambitions of the monopolistic horde which is pulling the strings of the President. America’s integrity is gone. Perjured and blackened, she crawls at the feet of Mammon, dragging the helpless Cubans and Filipinos in the mire behind her. It is the beginning of the end.

The ruthless destroyers of our national honor have thrown all pretense to the winds. It is now militarism, another cycle of tyranny, or the overthrow of the entire wicked system by socialism, by Christian brotherhood.”

“Militarism, another cycle of tyranny.” That is an expression containing a world of truth, over which every sincere American may well pause until he thinks himself into a deep and irresistible sense of his duty. Mammon may be possibly the biggest god in the gang which is endeavoring to ruin the nation, but he is not the only one. There are others as long-legged, as powerfully armed, as fierce-eyed as he. These must all be sought out and driven from our domains, else the new “cycle of tyranny” will complete itself as fatally as did that of slavery. The only remedy, as the *Social Crusader* says, is the enthronement in the individual, in the community, in the state and the nation, of Christian brotherhood, as Jesus Christ would have interpreted the words.

The article by Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin of Connecticut on “The Entry of the United States into World Politics as one

of the Great Powers,” which appeared in the *Yale Review* for February and has since been put into pamphlet, is a very lucid and interesting paper. He traces the salient steps by which our country has come to be recognized by other nations as one of the Great Powers, without in general pronouncing judgment upon their moral character. The fact of our becoming such a power he considers the inevitable result of our increase in numbers and wealth. The general tenor of the paper indicates that Judge Baldwin finds much less than we do to criticise in some of the national conduct during the past two years. There is in passages, however, a broad hint that he feels both the rudeness and the selfishness with which “the big boy that was hulking in the background” has “elbowed” his way into the international crowd of big fellows. It is a very doubtful compliment which he pays to our government in these sentences: “Spain was soon at our mercy. What terms of peace should be prescribed? We concluded to adopt the rule of *uti possidetis*. In truth, the war had awakened the tiger in us. It was our first real taste of blood; it gave us, that is, our first conquests. The Mexican war had resulted in large purchases of territory, but we can hardly call our acquisition of Porto Rico or the Philippines anything but spoils of victory, notwithstanding the *solatium* of twenty millions provided for in the treaty of cession.” This is cool, graceful, judicial language, but it comes within a hair-line of meaning “guilty of robbery in the first degree.” Judge Baldwin’s treatment of the steady enlargement of the powers of the President evinces fine insight. This enlargement, he shows, comes from the fact that the President is invested with the entire executive power of

the nation, and from the yearly development of the body of federal law and of the relations of the government to other nations. While he recognizes the subtle dangers involved in this enlargement of presidential power, and feels the importance of maintaining the checks to its abuse provided in our system of government, yet he contends for the preservation of the absolute independence of the executive in its relations to the Congress. In regard to the application of the principles of the Hague Convention for the pacific settlement of international controversies, Mr. Baldwin takes the opposite view to that held by Hon. F. W. Holls. The latter holds that the submission to the Hague Court of any particular dispute will require a special treaty to be ratified by the Senate. Mr. Baldwin contends that the ratification of the Hague treaty by the Senate turns the whole matter of the execution of its provisions over to the President, and that he alone will have the decision of what cases shall be submitted to the Court. The appointment by the President of our four members of the Court, without the advice and consent of the Senate, certainly supports the latter view, which Mr. Baldwin argues with great force. It will be extremely interesting to see what interpretation is put upon the matter by the first case which our government shall submit to the Court. In general, Judge Baldwin believes in our taking our share in the affairs of the world, and that the limitations imposed by our form of government are not as a whole in practice inimical to effective diplomacy.

Pan-American Exposition.

The preparations for the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo are rapidly nearing completion. The Exposition will open on the 1st of May and continue till the 1st of November. It promises to be in some respects the greatest exposition that the world has ever seen. It will not occupy quite as much space as either the Paris or the Chicago Expositions, but it will probably much surpass either of them in the originality and splendor of its architecture and in the general beauty of its grounds. Niagara Falls is to supply the entire power for the light, and the whole of Niagara will still be left for people to see and admire. One of the peculiar characteristics of this Exposition will be the extensive exhibits from the South American republics. Some of them are spending large sums of money in preparing their exhibits. The nations which will be represented in this Exposition at Buffalo number one hundred and thirty millions of people. The gathering of so many of these at Buffalo and the exhibits of the products of their thought and labor will give opportunity for wider mutual acquaintance and understanding. This must inevitably lead to larger sympathy between them and to the disappearance of many prejudices, and

thus contribute much to the spirit of good will and peace among all the states of the Western world. The managers of the Exposition hope to make it a great "international information clearing house." These managers are to be commended for the high character of the abundant advertising which they have done, the most of which has been of extraordinary beauty, clearness and truthfulness. Two pamphlets lying before us, one in green cover, the other in white, could scarcely be outdone as specimens of the printer's and the engraver's art. While we write this, we remember that the preparations for this great Exposition will have cost from ten to fifteen millions of dollars; an enormous sum — no, a comparatively small sum; less than the cost of three first-class battleships. Give us the expositions every time, minus a few unworthy follies, and deliver us from the savage monsters of the sea. The expositions are emblems of civilization and very efficient promoters thereof, while the battleships are symbols of the brute and the savage which still survive to degrade and put us to shame.

Spencer on Patriotism.

In his "Study of Sociology," Herbert Spencer expresses, in his calm, philosophic way, a fine appreciation of the weakness and narrowness of the ordinary conception of patriotism:

"Patriotism is nationally that which egoism is individually — has, in fact, the same root; and along with kindred benefits brings kindred evils. From too much there results national aggressiveness and national vanity. As disproportionate egoism, by distorting a man's conception of self and others, vitiates his conclusions respecting human nature and human actions, so disproportionate patriotism, by distorting his conceptions of his own society and of other societies, vitiates his conclusions respecting the natures and actions of societies.

"Here we come upon one of the many ways in which the corporate conscience proves itself less developed than the individual conscience. For while excess of egoism is everywhere regarded as a fault, excess of patriotism is nowhere regarded as a fault. A man who recognizes his own errors of conduct and his own deficiencies of faculty shows a trait of character considered praiseworthy; but to admit that our doings towards other nations have been wrong is reprobated as unpatriotic. Defending the acts of another people with whom we have a difference seems to most citizens something like treason; and they use offensive comparisons concerning birds and their nests by way of condemning those who ascribe misconduct to our own people rather than to the people with whom we are at variance. Not only do they exhibit the unchecked sway of this reflex egoism which constitutes patriotism; not only are they unconscious that there is anything blameworthy in giving rein to this feeling,—but they think the blameworthiness is in those who restrain it, and try to see what may be said on both sides. . . . When antagonism has bred a desire to justify the hatred by ascribing hateful characters to members of that nation, it inevitably happens that the political arrangements under

which they live, the religion they profess, and the habits peculiar to them, become associated in thought with these hateful characters — become themselves hateful and cannot therefore have their natures studied with the calmness required by science.”

City and State of Philadelphia thus describes in striking language the spirit of relentless commercialism now racking the world to such an appalling degree:

“A terrible trouble is disturbing the earth at the present time. It more resembles a species of insanity than anything else. As we know, among members of an undeveloped society the maniacal tendency is not common; that tendency is an accompaniment of civilization. All must have noted the fact that the possession of extraordinary endowments and a facile loss of mental balance, or great wits and madness, as the poet has told us, are somehow near allied. They have a way of going together. Just so here. To-day it is not the dull nations, but the bright ones, the most advanced in refinement and everything of that sort, that seem craziest in the craze at this moment sweeping the world. The dementia is practically an exclusive possession of the Great Powers of Europe, troubling England worst, but reaching out and affecting us in this country in some ways, perhaps, worst of all. It seems a madness of the Anglo-Saxon, as he loves to call himself, more than of any other people. And plainly this madness is the result of a disease; it is the outworking of the greed microbe, or it comes from the yeasting in the human blood of the lust for property and dominion. And because of this frenzied, grasping tendency, which, as a sort of demonism, has taken possession of the leading nations of men, and of our own people and the ruling element among them particularly, the whole earth is plunged into a condition of singularly disastrous feud and conflict at the present moment. . . . Leading nations have simply fallen into a veritable madness in their scramble for trade. That is precisely the way things are. Commercial interests, so called, stand ready and are eager to sacrifice everything—untold treasures of the people at large, along with their highest rights and profoundest welfare—in order to keep or attain supremacy for themselves and the furthering of their ends. Think what, under this influence, not only Great Britain and we in America, but Russia also, and Germany and France and Italy, are ready to spend in this desperate rivalry! Millions on millions of the people's money are these nations hot to lavish in outlay so as to buy or bribe the chief advantage in trade lines, the one against the other. This is at the bottom of our militarism. Here is what our wars mean. . . . War, we may rest assured, is always precisely as General Sherman characterized it. There is no good in it for anybody; only evil—the consummation of evil. A trade war is the same as any other. Greed is behind it; and we have the highest authority for holding that greed is behind all wars. They come of men's lusts. But to-day, greed in the elaborations and marvelous complications of modern life has become an overmastering disease. The whole land is swept by it. Society quivers in its sway; so do our churches and our homes. Commerce is maddened

by it. It is a craze in the heart of the nations. It has well nigh come to be a veritable demoniacal possession, driving the whole wide world, and especially the peoples that ought to be conspicuous in light and leading, into a desperate frenzy, making the immediate outlook for highest human welfare very dark and foreboding.”

Military Dominant. It needs but little consideration to see the increasing dominance over the nation of military ideas and demands. The appropriations in two years of the fifty-fourth Congress, before the Spanish War was entered upon, were \$1,044,580,273. The fifty-fifth Congress, during which the Spanish War occurred, made appropriations in two years of \$1,568,212,637. The fifty-sixth Congress, just closed, appropriated in two years \$1,440,062,545. This latter sum is nearly \$400,000,000 more than the total appropriations made in two years before the Spanish War came on. It would have been much larger if the needed internal improvements of the country had not been sacrificed. Every demand of the military was met by the Congress, no matter how many millions were asked for. Every plea for economy here was trampled under foot. On the other hand, the River and Harbor Bill was killed, new public buildings were refused, just claims of honest people against the government were not provided for. There was no money for these things. All that members of Congress dared to vote had been voted, including the vast sums to army and navy. Prior to the Spanish War the army was costing but \$23,000,000 a year. For the last two years it has cost \$115,000,000 a year, and for the coming year it will be still more. The navy was costing before the war but a little over \$30,000,000 a year. It is now costing between \$70,000,000 and \$80,000,000 a year, and the indications are clear that the naval budget will rapidly go much beyond this sum. The pension appropriations, which were beginning to decrease, are rapidly rising again. The increase was \$8,000,000 during the fifty-sixth Congress. The people flatter themselves that we are in an era of great prosperity, and close their eyes to these facts of ill-omen. In his roseate address on inauguration day, President McKinley spoke as if he were entirely ignorant of their existence. But there they stand on the books of Congress, significant in themselves, but doubly significant as symbols of the daring and dangerous policy which has already driven us so far into an exacting and imperious militarism, from which the escape will be more and more difficult, if not impossible.

Utmost Amount of Suffering. It is always an easy thing to prove one's goodness by the method of showing that some one else is just as wicked or worse. That seems to have been the method adopted

by the British Secretary of War, as quoted in the *Montreal Star*, in attempting recently to parry the thrusts of those who charged that the South African War had been conducted in a particularly inhuman way. He said:

"War cannot be made without the utmost amount of human suffering. All you can do is to palliate that suffering and alleviate it as much as you can. What Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener have had to do will bear comparison with the humanity of any war that has been waged. There is no war which has ever been carried on before in which the general began by sending on parole all those who were willing to go back to their farms; there has been no war in which the general has attempted successfully to feed all the women and children who came to him. Go back to the American war and see the devastation of tracts of country by Sheridan and Sherman; go back to the Franco-German War and see what was found necessary by the German generals through many months when they were in a hostile country. So far from honorable members calling on their gods to witness against their own fellow-countrymen, I say that we have a right to be proud of the humanity of our officers. We have a right also to be proud that in all these difficulties we have scarcely heard of one outrage by a private soldier, and we can hardly trace a single case in which a general has by some hasty expression or decision diverged from the path which we expecting quietly here find it so easy to trace out for him."

The Secretary means by this either to cover up or to justify (more probably both) the outrageous farm-burning and pillaging which have been done in South Africa — deeds which are now absolutely and universally condemned by the formulated rules of so-called civilized warfare, which England was among the first to adopt. It is by her own standard that England is condemned, not by what may or may not have been done in some war of the past or by some other country. And this is where she appears in such black colors. But the passage is chiefly important as a confession that war can never be civilized in any real sense. It is not often that war-supporters admit this in as cold-blooded a way as the British War Secretary has done. It is not war secretaries and generals that are fond of quoting General Sherman's pithy saying that "war is hell." They do not like to put themselves in that category. "The utmost amount of human suffering" — that is what the friends of peace have always been saying about war, as evidence that it ought to be definitively and forever abolished. The South African War may compare favorably in humanity (inhumanity) with many other wars, but that is not to the point; there is no humanity in any war — in any real, serious war. There is nothing in the way of suffering and cruelty that in the last extremity a belligerent will not inflict if necessary to secure the final victory. In these extremities — and they come in all serious contests — all sense of the

rights of opponents passes away, and it is just kill, kill, destroy, inflict suffering, anything to beat the enemy into submission. If the British War Secretary would only open his moral eyes a little more, his premises would lead him to a course far different from that of coloring South African desolators into saints at the top of the calendar.

Revelations
of War.

Dr. R. H. Thomas, writing of "Mixed Motives" in the *March Messenger of Peace*, makes the following very sensible utterances:

"The atrocities that have occurred in South Africa and in the Philippines have been terrible and disgraceful, but they are inevitable accompaniments of a war of subjugation, and, if this truth could once permeate the minds of the Christian public, there would be less and less approval of war. There has never been a war that has been fought out to the death, that has not been full of just such and even worse atrocities; but these are forgotten and hidden away in histories that are more concerned with realities than with the rhetoric of martial deeds. Good people endorse war because of the good things that may fairly be said of it. It develops a certain kind of courage, a personal devotion, prompt obedience and a readiness to suffer and to lose one's life for something that involves no personal gain and often but little glory. These are good things in themselves, but they have been emphasized to the exclusion of other things connected with the life and profession of a soldier that are even more universally true, and which so far outweigh the good as to show a frightful balance against war. The recent revelations of its horrors are really the revelations of war, not in its accidental accompaniments, but in its essence."

There are clear evidences that these recent revelations of war as a business essentially iniquitous, in spite of the accidental good things accompanying it, are having the effect indicated in this quotation as desirable. Never before were so many Christian and non-Christian people coming out in definite and unreserved opposition to war in every form. So much has been said in recent years about the "civilizing" and "humanizing" of war that large numbers of persons have had their eyes "holden" to its real nature. They have at last been undeceived. The campaigns of the most highly "civilized" armies that ever fought have recalled the days, not of Philip II. and Wallenstein only, but of pre-Christian times. Enlightenment of conscience has become so general and so strong that the deception cannot continue as it has been in the past. We shall come out of the present times of darkness and pain with a larger desertion from the ranks of war-supporters than has ever been known. This is to be the compensation for the days of humiliation and apparent defeat.

Christian Neighbor.

We greatly regret that the *Christian Neighbor*, which has been edited and published at Columbia, S. C., has been discontinued. It was started thirty-three years ago by Rev. Sidi H. Browne, a Methodist minister, and has appeared every week since until the middle of last month. It was begun with the view of promoting the cause of peace and goodwill among men. The founder of the paper held, as he said in the first issue, "that war is the greatest curse that ever falls on a people, and that those who make and prosecute war know little more 'what they do' than did those men who crucified the King of the Jews." He further held "that Christianity is the greatest blessing ever bestowed on the world, and that war exists only in the absence of the rule of Christianity; and that this greatest blessing and greatest curse are in essential antagonism, as much so as 'God and Mammon.'" The *Christian Neighbor*, to its very last line, was true to the original faith of its founder. In all the years that we have seen its pages, it has never given an "uncertain sound." It has been full of "sweetness and light." Its spirit has always corresponded to its name. It has opposed war vigorously and untiringly, but so full of love and brotherliness was the spirit of its editor that its great theme has always been peace, and its beauties and glories. It has been constructive in its work, building up the kingdom of love and peace. Thirty-three years of such work must bring a large fruitage in many ways, though we may not be able to point out how and where. One cannot but regret that such a voice for good is henceforth silent.

Commerce and Peace.

No more timely service is being rendered to the cause of peace than that by Edward Atkinson and other economists of his school, in their efforts to interpret to the world the real nature of true and profitable commerce. The theory has prevailed, and still prevails very largely, that commerce cannot be carried on profitably without beating down and crippling that of others and taking their field from them. This is at the root of much of the insane talk heard nowadays about "the fierce commercial war" on which the nations are said to be entering, which must be fought to the death by us, or the nation will go to ruin. How much fighting to the death, for the markets of the world, has this nation had to do to come to its present enormous international trade of two thousand millions of dollars worth a year? These economists undertake to show that commerce rightly understood is not war at all, even when carried on on the non-coöperative basis, as it has always been. Mr. Atkinson, in a recent lay sermon on the subject before the Third Universalist Church of Cambridge, Mass. (one of the most lucid and powerful addresses ever given by him), declared that

the golden rule of commerce is, "Thou shalt serve thy neighbor as thyself." This, interpreted, means that whatever we may do to build up and strengthen the productive power of other countries is for the good of ourselves, where proper freedom of trade and mutual trust exist. He cites, in proof, the enormous increase in the trade and commerce of Great Britain, who has kept her commercial sphere open on equal terms to all comers. Commerce, he insists, to reach its maximum development, requires absolute probity and integrity, and the avoidance of all deception and underhandedness. Interpreted in this sense, true commerce is the highest possible expression in material things of love and mutual helpfulness. It is, therefore, the largest and most constantly active peacemaker which exists. Even hedged about with ignorance and selfish restrictions as it at present is, it nevertheless is constantly and in ever larger scope working out the unity and concord of the world. At home "absolute free trade, over a wider area and a greater number of people than enjoy its benefits elsewhere in the world, constitutes the bond of union among the forty-five states of this country, and is the guaranty of peace among them." If so-called statesmen and benevolent assimilators, instead of talking about fierce commercial war, and urging it on with all their might regardless of what becomes of other peoples, would treat the subject in this lofty Christian spirit, we should promote our foreign trade much faster than can possibly be done by pushing our way by force, and at the same time we should break down the fear of us abroad, which our present boastful and unfeeling spirit is creating. If we force the European nations to close their markets against us, it will be many a year before we can create new markets in the East and in the tropics from which we can get anything like as good returns. Commercial war is just as wicked in its way as any other war, and civilized peoples ought to be ashamed even to talk of it.

Philippine War and Literature.

It has often been said that the cause is false which poets do not sing. In a recent article James Lane Allen discusses the effect of the Philippine War on our authors, and finds nothing in the literature which it has produced to commend it; or, rather, he finds that its effect has been to stifle all literary celebration of it and to induce a good deal of condemnatory literature. Its injustice has been so great that the muse of poetry has been hushed into absolute silence. "I challenge any one," he says, "to make any sort of collection of American literature that celebrates our long war of two years to subjugate an innocent people who never wronged us but by desiring the same liberty which we ourselves would die to defend." "So far from there having been any national

literary response to our war in the Philippines, it is certain that there has begun to appear a literature against it; and if our policy is not changed, this literature of revolt will deepen and spread." Every one must have noticed the fact to which Mr. Allen here calls attention. It would not be at all difficult to gather together in a short time a large number of poems, some of them of a very high order (like the fine poem by Mrs. Hoyt, published in our March issue), condemning in sad or indignant verses the wrong which we have been doing, the lapse from that high spirit and conduct which has animated our past and set all the poets to singing. The course taken with practical unanimity by our literary men and women in reference to the Philippine aggression has been one of the most encouraging things in the national life. One may be perfectly sure of what Whittier, Lowell, Longfellow and Emerson would have written with passionate pen, if they had been still with us.

Brevities.

. . . When the Filipino leaders, General Pilar and others, were placed on the United States ships for deportation to Guam, the wives, children and sweethearts followed to the wharf, weeping and tearing their hair. Gray-headed women, some of them mothers of the prisoners, ran barefoot in the road, tears streaming down their faces. Delightful reading to liberty-loving Americans!

. . . Chaplain Nave of the United States army declares that "alcohol has actually slain more soldiers since the organization of our army than all our wars except the Civil War," and that it "has loaded pension lists with men who lie as a burden on the people."

. . . The *Saturday Evening Post* says that "the independence which the United States will give to Cuba is beautifully done up in red tape, with the long end in Washington." This figure is exact except the "red tape," which ought to have been "hemp rope."

. . . Mr. John Mather of Manchester, England, writes to the editor of this paper: "I trust that your great country may be saved from the military madness that is costing us so dearly."

. . . The judicial congress, composed of two official delegates from each of the Central American republics, which held its sessions during February at Salvador City, Salvador, formulated a declaration that hereafter all exchange of products between the Central American states shall be free of duties. It is said that all the governments will ratify this declaration.

. . . The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of (Liberal) Friends, with a membership of more than eleven thousand, has through its Committee on Peace and Arbitration sent to the legislature at Harrisburg a strong protest against the passing of any bill having for its object the introduction of military drill into the public schools of the state.

. . . John Morley has suggested that in future when the toast "the navy and the army" is proposed, it should be extended a little, and the wording should be: "The navy and the army, and the clergy of all denominations."

. . . A great peace meeting was held on the 8th of February at Hamburg, Germany, under the auspices of the Hamburg-Altona Peace Society, the audience numbering two thousand people. Addresses were made by Mr. Kopsch of the Reichstag and by Mr. Hennings of Cape Colony.

. . . *L'Arbitrage entre Nations*, the organ of the French International Arbitration Society, begins the new century in an enlarged and improved form. The first number contains able articles by eminent men, among others one on "The Peace Movement," by Frederic Passy.

. . . Theodore Parker used to say, speaking of the Mexican War and of slavery, that ministers and churches "make unnecessary haste to find excuses for war and national wickedness."

. . . The *Literary Digest* of March 16 copies a considerable portion of the address on the "Absurdities of Militarism" delivered by Ernest Howard Crosby at the commemorative peace meeting in Tremont Temple on the 16th of January. This address is now published in pamphlet form by the AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

. . . Many army chaplains recently assigned to service in the Philippines have made such serious objections to the order that Secretary Root has been compelled to reconsider it. These war-ministers do not seem to covet the glory of dying in tropical hospitals for their country and for the spiritual welfare of the fighting men!

. . . The British naval estimates for the coming year reach a total of £30,875,500, or in round numbers \$150,000,000.

Open Letter to President McKinley.

At the regular bimonthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society held on March 25 (the first meeting of the Board after the adjournment of Congress and the putting of the whole power of government in the Philippines into the hands of the President), it was voted unanimously to publish the following open letter to President McKinley:

William McKinley, President of the United States:

The war mania of these last few years outrages the conscience of the civilized world. The most advanced nations have been guilty. Our attack on Spain, justified by many on the score of humanity to the outraged Cubans, set on fire the passions of war, which still rage in the Philippines.

We earnestly appeal to you to exert your powers to the utmost to bring this cruel war to the earliest possible termination, and meanwhile to prohibit all those acts of torture by our soldiers or under the surveillance of our officers, which have been officially reported and which would have been inconceivable to America a few years ago.

We appeal to you to issue a proclamation to the Filipinos over your own signature, pledging to them the fullest Rights and Liberties, with all possible magnanimity in your own good judgment.